(b) whether it is a fact that the reply of the management dated 8-5-89 to the official indicates that the meeting took place on 14-3-89 in the office of C&MD or not, together with reasons therefor;

(c) whether it is a fact that some enquiry was conducted concerning the official and if so, the details thereof; and

(d) the reasons for not giving the details of the letters as stated, instead of giving an extract of it?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO): (a) to (d) The question relates to a former Marketing Executive of IDPL whose services were terminated by the company in accordance with the provisions of Conduct, Discipline and Appeal Rules of the company. For employees below the Board level, Government is neither the Appointing, Disciplinary, Appellate nor the Reviewing Authority and as such the Government does not intervene in the service matters of such employees of the public sector undertakings.

The company has reported that the said emoloyee had filed a Writ Petition in the Hon'ble Delhi High Court against the disciplinary proceedings initiated against him by the management and the Writ Petition was dismissed by the Hon'ble Delhi High Court. While dismissing the petition the Hon'ble Delhi High Court observed "The petitioner has been unauthorisedly abstaining himself from joining since March, 1989. This is nothing short of indiscipline. In these circumstances, we are not inclined to interfere. Dismissed". Aggrieved by these orders of the High Court, the petitioner filed two Special Leave Petitions in the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India which were also rejected.

Refusal of Leave to Marketing Executive, IDPL

3098. SHRI MD. SALIM : Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to the reply given to the Unstarred Question No. 1910 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 13th May, 1993 and state :

(a) the reasons for refusing the leave to the Marketing Executive of IDPL;

(b) the reasons, when leave is sanctioned and the office order is not issued then who will be responsible for this action: and

(c) the reasons, the reply given to the part (d) of the referred question that "disciplinary proceedings were completed or concluded or extinguished against the concerned employees" and give the list of the such employees with dates of completing above mentioned actions.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO) : (a) to (c) The question relates to a former Marketing Executive of IDPL whose services were terminated by the company in accordance with the provisions of Conduct, Discipline and Appeal Rules of the company. For employees below the Board level, Government is neither the Appointing, Disciplinary, Appellate nor the Reviewing Authority and as such the Government does not intervene in the service matters of such employees of the public sector undertakings.

The comany has reported that the said empolyee had filed a Writ Petition in the Hon'ble Delhi High Court against the disciplinary proceedings initiated against him by the management and the Writ Petition was dismissed by the Hon'ble Delhi High Court. While dismissing the petition the Hon'ble Delhi High Court observed "The petitioner has been unauthorisedly abstaining himself from joining since March, 1989. This is nothing short of indiscipline. In these circumstances, we are not inclined to interfere. Dismissed." Aggrieved by these orders of the High Court, the petitioner filed two Special Leave Petitioners in the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India which were also rejected.

Landed Cost of Import of Drugs

3099. PROF. I. G. SANADI : Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state :

(a) what was the landed cost of import of Carbamezapine, Griseofulvin, Furazolidone, Sulphadiazine, Cefotraxim and Cephaloridine during 1992-93;

(b) on what price of these drugs are the formulation prices of leader/leading packs based and since when;

(c) whether it is a fact prices of drugs have been taken higher than the actual landed cost of imports; and

(d) if so, what is the unintended benefits made by the formulators during the last three years, year-wise and what steps have been taken to recover the same?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO): (a) to (d) Landed cost based on latest available weighted average of c.i.f. price from Directorate General Health Services records duly adjusted for exchange rate and taking into account the prevailing custom and countervailing

duties and clearing charges has been adopted while revising the prices of formulations based on these drugs except Cefotaxime and Cephaloridine prices of which are not controlled.

Import of Bulk Drugs

3100. PROF I. G. SANADI : Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state :

(a) whether it is a fact that not more than fifty bulk drugs and not more than thirty finished medicines are being imported in the country;

(b) if so, what are the names of the bulk drugs and finishd medicines imported year-wise, during the last three years and what was the total CIF value of each drug and finished medicines per year;

(c) the number of these drugs and finished medicines which are outside price control;

(d) what is the criteria under which each has been kept outside price control;

(e) whether it a fact that the imports of penultimate and intermediate is increasing every year; and

(f) if so, what was the total imports of intermediates/penultimates during the last three years, year-wise?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO) : (a) and (b) No Sir. Though the country is self sufficient in respect of almost all formulation requirement and 70% of bulk drug requirements (in value terms), in terms of numbers, about 350 bulk drugs and 100 formulations are reported to be imported of different values and quantities.

(c) and (d) A background note for discussion on the Review of Drug Policy, 1986 has been placed on the Table of the House on 12-8-1992.

(e) and (f) Due to the increase in indigenous production and exports, the import of raw material also increases. However the pharmaceutical sector has been maintaining positive trade balance successively for the last four years. The import value of intermediates during the last three years is given below :

Year	Intermediate C.I.F. Value
1989-90 . .	Rs. 168.20 crores
1990-91 . .	Rs. 176.70 crores
1991-92 . .	Rs. 243.75 crores

Cost of fertilizer production at Sindri Unit of FCI

3101. SHRI GAYA SINGH : Will the the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state :

(a) whether it is a fact that the Sindri Unit of the Fertilizer Corporation of India Limited produced fertilizer at costs comparable or lower than many high capacity plants;

(b) if so, whether Government are implementing and revamping proposal for increasing the capacity utilisation of the Unit; and

(c) what are the details of the revamping proposals, incremental returns projected, and actions taken by Government for their implementation?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO) : (a) No, Sir.

(b) and (c) The Fertilizer Corporation of India Ltd. (FCI) is implementing a revamping scheme for its Sindri Unit at an estimated cost of Rs. 16.23 crores, including a provision of Rs. 10.078 crores for revamping of the Captive Power Plant. FCI has already spent Rs. 4.46 crores on the scheme. FCI also has schemes estimated to cost of Rs. 33.30 crores for modernising the Sindri plant. The main objective of these schemes is to sustain production, combat pollution and improve capacity utilisation. During the year 1993-94, a budgetary provision of Rs. 67.50 crores has been made for FCI. In view of the budgetary constraints, it has not ben possible to take up FCI's proposal for a new Captive Power Plant of 2×19 MW capacity at an estimated cost of Rs. 142.64 crores.

Charge-sheet issued to Marketing Executive, IDPL

3102. SHRI BRAHMADEO ANAND PASWAN : Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to the reply to the unstarred question No. 462 given in the Rajya Sabha on 29th July, 1993 and state :

(a) whether it is a fact that the official had made clear to the management on 6th June, 1989 that the crux of the matter are the charges and not the transfer which he had already accepted in the meeting held on 14-3-89 in the office of C&MD;

(b) whether is it a fact that the official had been requesting the management that either he should be condemned or clear of the charges and should be informed in a direct manner instead of linking with the transfer, with reasons therefor;